

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheets of drawings include corrections made to Figs. 1-11. In compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d), the drawings were corrected to remove all handwritten text.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (11)

### **REMARKS**

By the present amendment, Applicant proposes to amend claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, and 39. Claims 1-40 remain pending. Claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 26, 29, and 35 are independent claims.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative in an informal phone discussion held on September 11, 2007 about the present Office Action. Specifically, the phone conversation discussed the rejections with respect to the phrase "substantially real time." During the phone conversation, Examiner S. R. Merchant explained to Attorney L. B. Varghese that since no prior art references were cited in the Office Action the claims would have been allowable had neither 35 U.S.C. §112, nor drawing issues been present. With respect to the terms "substantially real time," Examiner further explained that it is hard to substantiate between "real time" and "non-real time." The term "real time," on the other hand, is a relative term used in the industry. Examiner noted removal of the term "substantially" would obviate the present 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections. The Attorney also confirmed with the Examiner that the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 2, 7, 13, 16, 21, 27, 30 and 36 for having insufficient antecedent basis would be corrected by amending the original claimed limitation of "the one" to "one." Examiner's indication that the deletion of the term "substantially" and amendment of "the one" to "one" would make the claims allowable, is noted with appreciation.

In the recent Office Action, the Examiner requested corrected drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.121(d). Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to describe the meaning of the terms "substantially real time." Dependent claims 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 28, 31, 32, 34, 37, 38, and 40 were rejected for depending on a rejected base claim. Examiner rejected claims 1 - 40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Examiner also deemed claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, and 39 as being indefinite for using the phrase "substantially real time." Dependent claims 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 28, 31, 32, 34, 37, 38, and 40 were again rejected for depending on a rejected base claim. Examiner further found insufficient antecedent basis for use of the limitation "the one" in claims 2, 7, 13, 16, 21, 27, 30, and 36.

With respect to the drawings, Applicant has submitted corrected drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.121(d). Specifically, Applicant has removed all handwritten text from each figure (Figs. 1-11) and has labeled each figure as a "Replacement Sheet." Annotated sheets were not requested and as such were not submitted.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36 and 39 by deleting the term "substantially" to make the claims allowable as suggested by the Examiner. Claims depending from these claims should accordingly be allowable. Claims 3 and 8 did not use the term "substantially" and therefore were not amended.

Also, Applicant has amended claims 2, 7, 13, 16, 21, 27, 30 and 36 to correct for insufficient antecedent basis. In particular, Applicant has clarified the original claim language "the one of the plurality of analysts" to now specify that only "**one** of the plurality of analysts" who provided the specific company valuation is communicated to as opposed to the plurality of analysts who did not provide the specific company valuation information. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 7, 13, 16, 21, 27, 30 and 36, as amended, now meet the specific requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Applicant has amended a typographical error made in the specification. In the specification on page 20 line 5 (or para. 0073 in the publication) the reference number 515 is replaced with 525. Reference number 525 correctly shows "variance from Mean."

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is requested to kindly contact the undersigned in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 21, 2007

By:



Libby Babu Varghese  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 51,326  
Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP  
2 Wall Street  
New York, NY 10005  
Telephone No.: (212) 238-8727  
Facsimile No.: (212) 732-3232